DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 247 558 CS 208 347

AUTHOR Hale, F. Dennis
TITLE Chains versus Independents: Newspaper and Market Characteristics.
PUB DATE 5 Aug 84
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (67th, Gainesville, FL, August 5-8, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Business; Comparative Analysis; *Competition; *Marketing; Mass Media Effects; *Media Research; *Newspapers
IDENTIFIERS *Media Ownership; *Newspaper Chains; Newspaper Circulation

ABSTRACT

A study examined the marketing differences between large chain newspapers and small chain and independent newspapers by analyzing differences in characteristics of the newspapers, patterns of circulation, economic and social conditions of the market, and competition from other print media. The 200 newspapers studied--113 large chain and 87 small chain and independent papers--came from 41 states. Statistical analysis revealed that some 21 of the 54 independent variables examined were significantly correlated with large chain newspaper ownership--five concerned newspaper characteristics, three circulation, five print media competition, three economic variables, and five social characteristics. The findings showed that large chain papers had a number of advantages over their competition. They published in larger, more urban and more affluent markets with stronger magazine circulation and weaker circulation of outside Sunday papers. In addition, they managed to charge 14% more for subscriptions while publishing only 3% more issues per month. The results suggest that the real threat to newspapers does not come from the existing concentration of ownership, but from the continued absorption of independents by chains, from the subsequent absorption of small chains by large ones, and by the final absorption of large chains by corporate conglomerates. (A list of counties, cities, and states providing the studied newspapers is appended.) (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED247558

CHAINS VERSUS INDEPENDENTS: NEWSPAPER AND MARKET CHARACTERISTICS

by F. Dennis Hale
Associate Professor
School of Journalism
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403

Paper presented to the Mass Communication and Society Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication at Gainesville, Florida, August 5, 1984

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
F. Dennis Hale
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 208 347

ABSTRACT

Mass Communications and Society Division

CHAINS VERSUS INDEPENDENTS: NEWSPAPER AND MARKET CHARACTERISTICS

F. Dennis Hale
Associate Professor
School of Journalism
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403

Study examined the marketing differences between large-chain and small-chain and independent newspapers by analyzing differences in characteristics of the newspapers, patterns of newspaper circulation, economic conditions of the market, social conditions of the market, and competition from other print media. The sample consisted of 200 counties with dominant dailies (the only daily published in a county with minimal circulation from out-of-county papers). The sample contained papers from 41 states with 113 large-chain papers (four or more papers per chain) and 87 small-chain and independent papers. Large-chain ownership was correlated with 54 independent variables.

Some 21 of the 54 independent variables were significantly correlated with large-chain ownership: 5 concerned newspaper characteristics, 3 newspaper circulation, 5 print media competition, 3 economic variables, and 5 social characteristics.

Large-chain ownership was positively associated with days published per week, subscription rate, advertising rate, Parade, weekday circulation, Sunday circulation, county circulation, Better Homes & Garden, Fortune, New Yorker, People, household income, average rent, consumer spending, county population, Spanish speaking residents, county households, urban residents and population density. Chain ownership was negatively associated with circulation of out-of-county Sunday papers and with Family Weekly publication.

In conclusion, the large-chain papers had a number of advantages. They published in larger, more urban and more affluent markets with stronger magazine circulation and weaker circulation from outside Sunday papers. And the chain papers managed to charge 14 percent more for subscriptions while publishing only 3 percent more issues per month.

Chains Versus Independents: Newspaper and Market Characteristics

by F. Dennis Hale

> What, then, is the truth about the widely feared Thomson chain? Does it really suck all the profit it can from its new acquisitions without regard for journalistic quality or employee morale? Or does Thomson simply impose long-needed management reforms that cause resentment among lazy employees?1

The debate continues concerning the quality of chain versus independent newspapers. One year after the giant Thomson chain purchased the Kokomo Tribune, the editor was removed. The new publisher said that the old editor was insensitive to the needs of the local people. The departing editor said that powerful people in Kokomo hoped to use the new newspaper ownership to reassert their influence over the news operation.[2]

From Texas to Alaska, journalists both defend and criticize chain ownership. Ben Sargent, editorial cartoonist for the Austin American-Statesman, said that chain ownership improved his Texas paper: "A case can be made that chain ownership can render a paper more independent of the local pressures which reduce most small and medium-sized dailies, and many large ones, to anemic, blithering boosterism."[3] Investigative reporter, Bob Porterfield, said that the Anchorage Daily News ceased being a "boat-rocker and bush-shaker" after it was purchased by the McClatchy chain: "They say they want to build advertising before rocking the boat. I think that kind of philosophy slips over into a lot of these chain acquisitions."[4]

The growth of chains continues unabated. By late 1981, 155 chains controlled 1,136 of the 1,730 daily newspapers in the United States, representing 72 percent of weekday circulation and 75 percent of Sunday

---

The author is an associate professor in the School of Journalism at Bowling Green State University. This study was made possible by an associateship which was awarded for the summer of 1983 by the Faculty Research Committee of Bowling Green State University.

circulation.[5] By January 1983, 26 "double digit" newspaper chains controlled 10 or more dailies each. Toping the list were Gannett with 89 papers and Thomson with 81.[6] Most newspapers that are sold are purchased by chains. In 1983, 26 of 30 dailies were sold to chains.[7] The figures were 32 of 36 in 1982 and 30 of 38 in 1981.[8]

Literature Review

Various researchers have empirically compared chain and independent newspapers. Blankenburg contrasted the advertising and circulation strategies of Gannett with other chain and independent newspapers.[9] Grotta measured changes in advertising and subscription rates and the news hole in newspapers that changed from independent to chain.[10] And Thrift Jr.,[11] Wackman and Gillmor,[12] and Wagenberg and Soderlund[13] analyzed the editorials in chain and independent papers.

Grotta compared 40 papers that had changed from independent to chain papers between 1950 and 1968 with 114 papers that had remained independent or chain throughout the time period. He used regression analysis to examine a variety of quality-related variables including advertising and subscription prices, editorial employees, news hole size, editorial page news hole, and proportion of local news. Grotta identified no significant differences between independent and chain papers, concluding: "If there are indeed significant economic efficiencies from larger scale operation in the industry, this study indicates that those benefits are not being passed on to the consumer."[14]

Grotta's comparison of the proportion of space devoted to news in general, local news and editorial-page features is as close as any researcher has come to measuring the quality of news in chain and independent papers. However, three studies examined the influence of newspaper ownership on editorials. Two of the studies found substantial differences. The most

limited study, by Wagenberg and Soderlund, found no differences.[15] The Canadian researchers compared editorials about one national election in three independent papers and four papers from one chain. The study found no pattern within the chain and no difference between chain and independent papers. Regionalism emerged as a more important factor in shaping the themes of the 811 Canadian editorials.

Two, more comprehensive studies of chain and independent editorials found major differences. Wackman and Gillmor examined presidential endorsements by most American dailies for four elections, 1960 through 1972. They found that 6 to 10 percent more chain than independent papers made endorsements, that chain papers were more likely to favor the favorite candidate of the press, and that papers within a chain were overwhelmingly homogeneous in presidential endorsements. The researchers concluded: "Clearly these data run counter to the insistence of chain spokesmen that their endorsement policies are independent from chain direction."[16]

Thrift also identified major differences in editorials in his study of 24 West Coast papers during 1960 and 1975. Some 16 papers had changed from independent to chain during the period; 8 remained independent throughout. In 1960 there were no differences between editorials in the two groups of independent papers. In 1975, however, 7.9 percent of editorials in the chain papers were classified as argumentative, controversial and local, contrasted to 17.6 percent in the independent papers. Thrift concluded: "But clearly, this study demonstrates that chains have had an impact on the editorial quality of the dailies they have purchased on the West Coast. And certainly, the impact is not helpful to readers who seek guidance on local matters when they turn to the editorial pages of their daily newspapers."[17]

Blankenburg found major differences in the pricing and marketing strategy of Gannett papers compared to other chain and independent papers.

First, he compared changes in circulation during the 1970s for 35 Gannett and 35 other papers. This was a decade when newspapers faced cost increases, distribution problems and newsprint shortages. Gannett managed continued growth in revenue and ad and subscription rates despite reductions in total circulation and household penetration that exceeded those of non-Gannett papers.[18] Second, Blankenburg zeroed in on the key revenue source of dailies, local retail advertising, and contrasted local ad rates for 54 matched pairs of Gannett and non-Gannett papers.[19] Using 12 different measures of ad rates, derived from current rate cards of the 108 papers, Blankenburg found that Gannett rates were from 7.9 to 18.2 percent higher than the non-Gannett rates.

In conclusion, researchers have failed to find differences in news coverage between chain and independent papers. However, researchers have found major differences concerning editorials, marketing and pricing.

Methodology

This study looked further into the marketing differences of chain and independent newspapers by analyzing differences in characteristics of the newspapers, patterns of newspaper circulation, economic conditions of the market, social conditions of the market, and competition from other print media.

The study examined 200 "dominant" daily newspapers. A dominant daily was operationally defined as a newspaper that was the only daily published in a county in which out-of-county dailies reached fewer than 11 percent of local households. Newspapers published under joint-operation agreements were excluded. Dominant dailies were used to minimize the influence of outside newspapers and to examine the influence of a newspaper in a relatively pure environment.

The dependent variable, newspaper ownership, was based on the status of the paper in 1981.[20] If the paper was part of a chain of four or more papers, it was classified as a chain paper.[21]

There were five kinds of independent variables, for a total of 54:[22]

NEWSPAPER CHARACTERISTICS (7 variables)--days published per week, morning or evening, one edition or both morning and evening, advertising rate, monthly subscription rate, number of news services, number of weekend magazines.

NEWSPAPER CIRCULATION (7 variables)--total weekday, total Sunday, weekday penetration of county households, Sunday penetration, county weekday circulation, county circulation as percent of total weekday circulation, and Sunday circulation as a percent of total weekday circulation.

PRINT MEDIA COMPETITION (14 variables)--county circulation of weeklies, household penetration of weeklies, penetration of outside dailies, penetration of outside Sunday papers, and penetration of Better Homes & Gardens, Cosmopolitan, Farm Journal, Fortune, New Yorker, People, Playboy, Reader's Digest, Time and TV Guide.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS (10 variables)--unemployment, vacant rental units, median home value, median rent, mean consumer spending, percapita retail sales, and mean household income.

SOCIAL CONDITIONS (21 variables)--region of country, county population, decade population growth, Blacks, Spanish speaking, persons less than 18, persons over 64, median age, fertility ratio, married adults, persons in group quarters, county households, decade growth in households, owner occupied homes, non-English speaking, new to state in ten years, high school graduates, county size, population density, urban residents, persons per household.

The relationship between large-chain ownership and the 54 independent variables was measured by using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences program for nonparametric correlation coefficients. Nonparametric tests do not require that variables have a normal distribution or an interval scale. Because of the absence of formal hypotheses, two-tailed tests of statistical significance were used.

Findings

The resulting sample consisted of newspapers and counties from 41 states and included the cities of Mobile, Ala.: Fresno, Calif.; Des Moines, Iowa; Minneapolis, Minn.; Omaha, Neb.; Raleigh, N.C.; Cleveland, Ohio; Tulsa, Okla.; Memphis, Tenn.; Austin, Texas; Tacoma, Wash., and Milwaukee, Wis. There were 87 independent and small-chain papers and 113 papers from chains with four or more newspapers. (Appendix lists the newspapers.)

Some 21 of the 54 independent variables were significantly correlated with large chain ownership: 5 concerned newspaper characteristics, 3 newspaper circulation, 5 print media competition, 3 economics variables, and 5 social characteristics.

Five characteristics of large-chain papers were different than other newspapers: chains published an average of one more issue a month, had 14 percent higher subscription rates, had 23 percent higher advertising rates, were four times more likely to subscribe to the Sunday supplement, Parade, and were less likely to subscribe to the Sunday supplement, Family Weekly. The higher advertising rates were consistent with the larger circulation of the large-chain papers (an average of 30 percent greater weekday circulation and 26 percent greater circulation in their home county). However, the 14 percent higher subscription rate exceeded what would be justified by the 3 percent more issues published a month by chains. There were no differences between large-chain papers and others in the reliance on morning or evening editions or the number of editions published

TABLE 1. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CHAIN OWNERSHIP AND MEDIA AND MARKET CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristic	Correlation	Significance	Independent Mean	Chain Mean
NEWSPAPER CHARACTERISTICS				
Days Published Per Week	.196	.005	6.62	6.81
Monthly Subscription Price	.256	.001	5.38	6.12
Advertising Rate	.248	.001	0.86	1.06
Parade	.279	.001	.08	.31
Family Weekly	-.166	.019	.50	.44
NEWSPAPER CIRCULATION				
Total Weekday Circulation	.207	.003	54,374	70,884
Total Sunday Circulation*	.187	.016	68,655	86,480
County Weekday Circulation	.157	.026	35,300	44,600
PRINT MEDIA COMPETITION				
Outside Sunday Penetration	-.143	.044	.087	.068
Better Homes	.144	.042	.093	.101
Fortune	.219	.002	.0041	.0050
New Yorker	.150	.034	.0026	.0032
People	.155	.029	.030	.033
ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS				
Household Income	.182	.010	20,968	22,280
Average Rent	.176	.013	155.20	169.59
Consumer Spending Income	.176	.013	20,630	21,802
SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS				
County Population	.157	.027	138,126	177,805
Spanish Speaking	.186	.008	.027	.036
County Households	.162	.022	49,092	65,522
Percent Urban Residents	.204	.004	.647	.729
Population Density	.164	.020	245	285

*N=165; for other variables, N=200

every day (see Table 1).

The significantly higher circulation of chain papers reflected the elevated populations in their home counties. Chains had 30 percent higher weekday circulation, 26 percent higher Sunday circulation and 26 percent higher weekday in-county circulation. The chains were published in counties with an average of 29 percent more people and 33 percent more households.

Significantly, there were no differences between chains and independents in their penetration of county households on either weekdays or Sundays.

The five significant results for print competition indicated that chain papers had less competition from out-of-county dailies but were published in areas with heavier consumption of magazines. Penetration of the home county by outside Sunday papers was less for the chains--6.8 to 8.7 percent of households. Four of the ten national magazines examined in the study reached a significantly higher percentage of households in chain counties: Better Homes & Garden, Fortune, New Yorker, and People. The four magazines fall into low-, medium- and high-brow categories.

The three significant economic variables indicated that chain papers came from more affluent counties. Household income was 6 percent higher in the chain counties, rent was 10 percent higher and consumer spending was 6 percent higher.

Chain papers were published in more populous, urban counties. This was reflected in the five, significant social variables. Besides having larger populations and numbers of households, chain counties had greater population density and a larger percentage of urban residents. Chain counties also had proportionally more Spanish speaking residents. However, newspaper ownership was not related to the percentage of Black residents. Nor was it related to level of education, population mobility, age of residents, or population growth.

Conclusions

The large-chain newspapers in this study had a number of advantages. They published in larger, more urban and more affluent markets with stronger magazine circulation and weaker circulation from outside Sunday newspapers. And the large-chain papers managed to charge 14 percent more for subscriptions while publishing only 3 percent more issues.

Although statistically significant, the magnitude of the differences between large-chain and other newspapers was not great. The strongest correlation was .256. However, most of the significant correlations were around .200. With a .200 correlation, one variable only accounts for 4 percent of the variation in the other variable.

These findings were consistent with Blankenburg, who found that Gannett charged significantly more for its ads than other newspapers. The 113 large-chain papers in this study charged more for subscriptions and existed in economically healthier markets than the other newspapers.

A growing body of empirical research demonstrates that, indeed, chain papers are different from independents, that chains possess powerful magnets for drawing money out of communities, and that chain editorials tend to be innocuous. And no research indicates that chains use their superior economic leverage to deliver a better quality news product.

Future researchers should compare the quality of news in chain and independent papers.

The real threat to newspapers does not come from the existing concentration of ownership; it comes from the continued absorption of independents by chains, from the subsequent absorption of small chains by large chains, and by the absorption of newspaper chains by corporate conglomerates. Unfortunately, empirical research of existing conditions cannot measure the impact of such economic concentration on the future quality of news and commentary.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Jerry Chaney, "Thomson: The Giant Chain Puts Its Brand on a Formerly Independent Daily...," Publishers' Auxiliary, September 6, 1982, p. 10.

[2]Jerry Chaney, "Kokomo Editor Ousted by Thomson Publisher," Publishers' Auxiliary, October 4, 1982, p. 3.

[3]Ben Sargent, letter to the editor, Texas Observer, June 9, 1978, p. 24.

[4]Bill Bellows, "Why Investigative Reporting Is Dying," Editor & Publisher, March 14, 1981, p. .

[5]"Morning Circulation Tops P.M. Total for 155 Groups," Editor & Publisher, October 3, 1981, p. 44.

[6]"Double Digit Groups," Editor & Publisher, January 1, 1983, p. 43.

[7]"Foreign Publishers Top U.S. Sales," Editor & Publisher, January 7, 1984, p. 40.

[8]"Group Ownership Trend Continues--32 Out of 36," Editor & Publisher, January 1, 1983, p. 34.

[9]William B. Blankenburg, "Newspaper Ownership and Control of Circulation to Increase Profits," Journalism Quarterly, 59:390-398 (1982) and "A Newspaper Chain's Pricing Behavior," Journalism Quarterly, 60:275-280 (1983).

[10]Gerald L. Grotta, "Consolidation of Newspapers: What Happens to the Consumer?" Journalism Quarterly, 48:245-250 (1971).

[11]Ralph R. Thrift, Jr., "How Chain Ownership Affects Editorial Vigor of Newspapers," Journalism Quarterly, 54:327-331 (1977).

[12]Daniel B. Wackman et al., "Chain Newspaper Autonomy as Reflected in Presidential Campaign Endorsements," Journalism Quarterly, 52:411-420 (1975).

[13]Ronald H. Wagenberg and Walter C. Soderlund, "The Influence of Chain-Ownership on Editorial Comment in Canada," Journalism Quarterly, 5 :93-98 (197).

[14]Grotta, p. 250.

[15]Wagenberg and Soderlund, p. 98.

[16]Wackman et al., p. 419.

[17]Thrift, p. 331.

[18]Blankenburg, "Newspaper Ownership."

[19]Blankenburg, "A Newspaper Chain's Pricing."

[21]Ibid., p. 276. Blankenburg and others who have analyzed newspaper marketing have concluded that differences between chain and independent papers are more likely to be found in larger chains.

[20]1982 Editor & Publisher International Year Book (New York: Editor & Publisher, 1982), pp. 363-369.

[22]The 1982 Editor & Publisher Year Book was the source of newspaper characteristics. Magazine and newspaper circulation data came from Circulation '82/'83 (Malibu, California: American Newspaper Markets, 1982) and Newspaper Rates and Data for March 12, 1983 (Skokie, Illinois: Standard Rate and Data Service). Economic and social data came from the 1980 Census.

APPENDIX STATES, COUNTIES AND DOMINANT CITIES

ALABAMA (10 counties): Calhoun (Anniston), Etowah (Gadsten), Houston (Dothan), Jefferson (Birmingham), Lauderdale (Florence), Madison (Huntsville), Mobile (Mobile), Montgomery (Montgomery), Morgan (Decatur), Tuscaloosa (Tuscaloosa).

ALASKA (0 counties)

ARIZONA (0 counties)

ARKANSAS (2 counties): Craighead (Jonesboro), Sebastian (Ft. Smith).

CALIFORNIA (1 county): Fresno (Fresno).

COLORADO (2 counties): Mesa (Grand Junction), Pueblo (Pueblo).

CONNECTICUT (0 counties)

DELEWARE (0 counties)

FLORIDA (7 counties): Alachua (Gainesville), Bay (Panama City), Brevard (Cocoa), Duval (Jacksonville), Escambia (Pensacola), Leon (Tallahassee), Orange (Orlando).

GEORGIA (8 counties): Bibb (Macon), Chatham (Savannah), Colquitt (Moultrie), Dougherty (Albany), Lowndes (Valdosta), Muscogee (Columbus), Richmond (Augusta), Thomas (Thomasville).

HAWAII (0 counties)

IDAHO (5 counties): Ada (Boise), Bannock (Pocatello), Bonneville (Idaho Falls), Nez Perce (Lewiston), Twin Falls (Twin Falls).

ILLINOIS (5 counties): Adams (Quincy), Champaign (Champaign), Sangamon (Springfield), Vermilion (Danville), Winnebago (Rockford).

INDIANA (5 counties): Delaware (Muncie), Marion (Indianapolis), St. Joseph (South Bend), Vanderburgh (Evansville), Vigo (Terre Haute).

IOWA (4 counties): Linn (Cedar Rapids), Polk (Des Moines), Scott (Davenport), Woodbury (Sioux City).

KANSAS (4 counties): Reno (Hutchinson), Saline (Salina), Sedwick (Wichita), Shawnee (Topeka).

KENTUCKY (8 counties): Bell (Middlesboro), Christian (Hopkinsville), Daviess (Owensboro), Fayette (Lexington), Harlan (Harlan), Hopkins (Madisonville), Jefferson (Louisville), McCracken (Paducah).

LOUISIANA (7 counties): Caddo (Shreveport), Calcasieu (Lake Charles), East Baton Rouge (Baton Rouge), Iberia (New Iberia), Ouchita (Monroe), Rapides (Alexandria), Washington (Bogalusa).

MAINE (2 counties): Androscoggin (Lewiston/Auburn), Penobscot (Bangor).

MARYLAND (3 counties): Allegany (Cumberland), Washington (Hagerstown), Wicomico (Salisbury).

MASSACHUSETTS (0 counties)

MICHIGAN (7 counties): Bay (Bay City), Gogebic (Ironwood), Jackson (Jackson), Kalamazoo (Kalamazoo), Kent (Grand Rapids), Leelanau (Traverse City), Muskegon (Muskegon).

MINNESOTA (4 counties): Carlton (Duluth), Hennepin (Minneapolis), Murray (Worthington), Washington (St. Paul).

MISSISSIPPI (9 counties): Adams (Natchez), Forrest (Hattiesburg), Harrison (Biloxi), Hinds (Jackson), Lauderdale (Meridian), Lee (Tupelo), Lowndes (Columbus), Pike (McComb), Warren (Vicksburg).

MISSOURI (5 counties): Adair (Kirksville), Audrain (Mexico), Buttler (Poplar Bluff), Greene (Springfield), Randolph (Moberly).

MONTANA (4 counties): Cascade (Great Falls), Missoula (Missoula), Silver Bow (Butte), Yellowstone (Billings).

NEBRASKA (3 counties): Douglas (Omaha), Lancaster (Lincoln), Scotts Bluff (Scottsbluff).

NEVADA (1 county): Washoe (Reno).

NEW HAMPSHIRE (0 counties)

NEW JERSEY (0 counties)

NEW MEXICO (4 counties): Chaves (Roswell), Curry (Clovis), McKinley (Gallup), San Juan (Farmington).

NEW YORK (5 counties): Broome (Binghampton), Chemung (Elmira), Clinton (Plattsburgh), Jefferson (Watertown), Onondaga (Syracuse).

NORTH CAROLINA (8 counties): Brunswick (Wilmington), Buncombe (Asheville), Durham (Durham), Forsyth (Winston-Salem), Mecklenburg (Charlotte), Onslow (Jacksonville), Wake (Raleigh), Wayne (Goldsboro).

NORTH DAKOTA (5 counties): Burleigh (Bismarck), Cass (Fargo), Grand Forks (Grand Forks), Stutsman (Jamestown), Ward (Minot).

OHIO (5 counties): Cuyahoga (Cleveland), Lucas (Toledo), Marion (Marion), Richland (Mansfield), Scioto (Portsmouth).

OKLAHOMA (3 counties): Comanche (Lawton), Garfield (Enid), Tulsa (Tulsa).

OREGON (4 counties): Josephine (Grants Pass), Klamath (Klamath Falls), Lane (Eugene), Polk (Salem).

PENNSYLVANIA (2 counties): Erie (Erie), Lycoming (Williamsport).

RHODE ISLAND (0 counties)

SOUTH CAROLINA (6 counties): Anderson (Anderson), Charleston (Charleston), Florence (Florence), Greenville (Greenville), Richland (Columbia), Spartanburg (Spartanburg).

SOUTH DAKOTA (6 counties): Beadle (Huron), Brown (Aberdeen), Codington (Watertown), Davison (Mitchell), Minnehaha (Sioux Falls), Pennington (Rapid City).

TENNESSEE (6 counties): Greene (Greenville), Henry (Paris), Madison (Jackson), Montgomery (Clarksville), Shelby (Memphis), Davidson (Nashville).

TEXAS (13 counties): Angelina (Lufkin), Ector (Odessa), Lubbock (Lubbock), McLennan (Waco), Nueces (Corpus Christi), Randall (Amarillo), Smith (Tyler), Taylor (Abiline), Tom Green (San Angelo), Travis (Austin), Victoria (Victoria), Wichita (Wichita Falls), Bowie (Texarkana).

UTAH (1 county): Weber (Ogden).

VERMONT (1 county): Chittenden (Burlington).

VIRGINIA (4 counties): Campbell (Lynchburg), Pittsylvania (Danville), Rockingham (Harrisonburg), Washington (Bristol).

WASHINGTON (5 counties): Franklin (Pasco), Pierce (Tacoma), Spokane (Spokane), Walla Walla (Walla Walla), Yakima (Yakima).

WEST VIRGINIA (10 counties): Cabell (Huntington), Harrison (Clarksburg), Randolph (Elkins) , Marion (Fairmont), Mercer (Bluefield), Mingo (Williamson), Monongalla (Morgantown), Ohio (Wheeling), Raleigh (Beckley), Wood (Parkersburg).

WISCONSIN (5 counties): Dane (Madison), Eau Claire (Eau Claire), Milwaukee (Milwaukee), Portage (Stevens Point), Sheboygan (Sheboygan).

WYOMING (1 county): Natronia (Casper).